DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 613 SP 017 971

AUTHOR Roper, Susan Stavert; Nur, Mary M.
TITLE Lessons from Teacher Corps in Winning Over School Staffs to Research Utilization.
PUB DATE Feb 81
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Attitude Change; *Change Strategies; Educational Innovation; Inservice Teacher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Needs Assessment; *Program Implementation; *Research Utilization; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Motivation
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

Successful strategies used by a research team in establishing collegiality with school staffs so that research results could be succesfully implemented are described. During the initiation phase of a five-year project, four basic strategies were used to win over school staffs: paying attention to changing needs in the schools, building trust and credibility, balancing long-term and short-term goals, and establishing personal relationships with teachers and administrators. During the second and third years of the project, when the aim was to implement the changes planned during the initiation year, many of the strategies used in the initiation phase continued to be used. A description is given of a variety of extrinsic and intrinsic incentives designed to motivate school faculty to attend inservice activities. It was considered fundamentally important to establish a relationship with teachers in which researchers regarded them as valued colleagues rather than as clients. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

February 12, 1981

ED201613

1981 AERA Paper

Lessons from Teacher Corps in Winning Over School Staffs to Research Utilization

by

Susan Stavert Roper and Mary M. Nur

Teacher Corps is particularly well suited to a research utilization program. Participants from a university, schools and the community work together to improve education in low-income areas. Thus, university researchers establish a long-term relationship with the most important potential consumers of research, teachers, students and parents. Since each project includes a feeder system of schools, researchers can develop access to all grade levels (K-12) and subject areas. Through the Teacher Corps Community Council, researchers have a direct link to parents and community agencies as well. Moreover, the five-year funding of Teacher Corps Projects provides a setting for carefully designed, longitudinal studies.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Susan S. Roper
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

It is, therefore, not surprising that the Curriculum and Teacher Education Department members at Stanford's School of Education were delighted to learn of their successful proposal for a five-year Teacher Corps Project beginning in July of 1978. Some looked forward to providing inservice to teachers based on years of their own research. Others began planning five-year studies of student behavior and academic performance. One professor was ready with a test for placement of bilingual students that needed the input of teachers and student before it could be finalized. All faculty saw Teacher Corps as an opportunity to target their research efforts on concerns useful to practitioners.

SP 017971

Unfortunately, the response from the schools was less enthusiastic. We began our Project at the same time that Californians voted overwhelmingly for Proposition 13, to limit property taxes. The effect of this measure on the San Jose Unified School

District was disastrous. Teachers faced a salary freeze, larger class sizes and a drastically reduced force of teacher aides and district support staff. The Board began preparing for massive layoffs and issued termination notices to over half of the teachers in the Project's four schools. Some results of these actions were massive staff turnover and reassignment of teachers to subjects they had never taught. Teachers reacted to these pressures with a range of emotions from anger to dispair, manifested by an official work slowdown and strike threats. The strike finally materialized for two agonizing weeks in September, 1980.

Recent research suggests that attempting change in this kind of environment is a losing battle. Rand (1975), for example, identifies a "healthy organizational climate" and "motivated participants" as essential preconditions at the school for a successful change agent project.[1] After working in an environment where the guiding principal seemed to be, "If anything can go wrong, it will," we would like to question these findings. In an environment lacking "motivated participants" or a "healthy organizational climate" a great deal of research utilization has taken place. Practitioners, at first reluctant and wary, have worked hard with researchers on an enormous variety of activities spanning all grades and including the areas of reading, writing, math, social studies, multi-cultural education, P.E., bilingual education, school discipline and administrative improvement. We believe that it is possible for researchers to work in an initially hostile environment, but it requires a whole new set of strategies.

The purpose of this paper is to share with other researchers strategies we found successful in winning over school staffs to research utilization. We divide these strategies into two sections: Those we used during the initiation phase, or the first year of the Project, and others we employed during our implementation phase or the second and third year. Although there is some overlap, we think it more instructive

to separate our report into these time frames. As Lou Carey points out, "Directing change efforts over a period of time becomes more manageable when the process is divided, then assessed and examined at each stage."[2]

INITIATION PHASE

During the initiation phase of our Project, we used four basic strategies to win over school staffs: paying attention to changing needs in schools, building trust and credibility, balancing long-term and short-term goals, and most difficult of all, learning to be patient.[3]

1. Pay Attention to Changing Needs at the School

Research is much more likely to be accepted by school people if it addresses their needs rather than needs defined by researchers. Identifying needs in specific schools is not easy. School people are overburdened with long, cumbersome needs assessments. Almost every categorical program requires a formal needs assessment that is usually out of date by the time it is submitted. With rapidly changing mandates from the federal, state and district level and high turnover of both teachers and students in inner-city schools, a one-shot, formal and complicated needs assessment does not make sense. We had to develop a variety of other ways to keep abreast of a staggering array of constantly changing needs.

One strategy was to require Project staff to complete a "Visitation Form" immediately after making a contact at the school. The who, what, when, where and whys on the forms were transferred to a card catalogue we labelled the "Concern File". This file was cross-referenced by school and subject area. Stanford people reviewed this file periodically before visiting schools and read it carefully before writing their plans for our second year. As a double check to the "Concern File", we paid teachers and community members a small consultant fee to read and revise sections of our second year proposal. They shared their reactions with Stanford teams in small

group meetings. The result was a proposal reflecting the most up-to-date account of school concerns that could be obtained.

2. Build Trust and Credibility

School people do not want their students to be used as guinea pigs for some professor's experiment. They often fear that research means having their problems held up as dirty laundry for the rest of the world to see. University professors, especially in a place as research-oriented as Stanford, are generally viewed by teachers as living in an unreal world of computers, statistics, and self-motivated students. A major priority of our Project, then, was to build trust and credibility. The general strategies that seemed to work best were: carefully selecting personnel, completely familiarizing ourselves with each school; demonstrating our ability to deal with the concrete realities of the classroom teachers; maintaining high visibility at the schools; and gaining the support of administrators.

The university personnel who worked most closely with the schools were graduate assistants in various component areas of the Teacher Corps Project, (i.e. reading, writing, math, P.E., social studies, bilingual education, multicultural education, discipline and administration). Each graduate assistant worked under the direction of a Stanford faculty member. Since graduate assistants were the key link between the Stanford and school faculties, they had to be selected with care. A requirement for the position was previous teaching or administrative experience not in an elite, suburban school but in an urban environment. Once teachers saw the these "academics" had a practical understanding of their situation, they were more open to exchanging ideas with them and with their Stanford faculty advisor.

Building credibility also requires gaining a working knowledge of how each school operates. This means more than learning the statistics on enrollment, test scores and absence rates. We had to learn about the informal power structure in the

schools by sitting in on faculty and departmental or "pod" meetings. In this way, we identified key people at each school who were most knowledgeable about how the school really operated.

As well as learning about each Project school, Teacher Corps people from Stanford had to show that they could deal with life in the classroom. Graduate assistants and Stanford faculty introduced new curriculum materials in the classroom, tested students, and occasionally took over classrooms to free teachers for inservice education. One of our graduate assistants counseled students referred to the principal for behavior problems. When teachers saw that he was effective in improving the behavior of these youngsters, his credibility soared. By the end of the year, he had organized a committee of teachers and students who totally revamped the discipline policy of the school.

A large part of trust building is simply to be there. By assisting in classroom acvities, eating lunch with faculty members, participating in staff meetings, attending student activities, and even lifting a few beers with the Friday afternoon TGIFers, we attempted to become a welcome part of the school landscape.

In retrospect, the seed for a number of our research utilization activities sprang from these spontaneous encounters. For example, during a chat in the high school faculty lounge, we learned from a few reading teachers of their anxiety about proficiency tests for graduation. Our reading team immediately did a content analysis of student performance on the test. Within a few days, they provide reading teachers a list of test items most frequently missed by their students and suggestions for raising test scores.

All of these efforts to build trust and credibility with teachers would have been futile without the support of the principal. The principal is the school "gatekeeper" of education reform.[4] The principal also provide recognition to those who participate in "extra" activities such as inservice planning and training. We,

therefore, met frequently with school administrators to keep them informed of Project activities and to listen to their concerns. Administrators rewarded our efforts by supporting the Project through attending inservice sessions, introducing us to teachers who were interested in working with us and publicizing our work through their faculty meetings.

3. Balancing Short-Term and Long-Term Goals

There is a built-in tension between university professors committed to long-term research and practitioners facing daily crises. It is tempting for researchers to criticize teachers as being short-sighted or anti-intellectual. Teachers retort that researchers are out of touch or irrelevant. As Gerald Pine points out, we need to remember that "The clash of values which is so clearly present in site resistance to change is the clash of legitimately differing interest".[5]

For several years researchers promoting change in schools have been encouraged to build a "sense of ownership" among teachers for the changes they promote. They have ognored or rejected Pine's contention that teachers and researchers have "legitimately differing interest". As a consequence they have at best co-opted school people into accepting their ideas, or at worst, alienated them so totally that it is often difficult for researchers to gain access to do research in schools. As Pine wryly observes, "The ideology of ownership more often expresses what we wish were true."[6]

The best solution we found for balancing long-term goals with short-term needs is the overtly political process of negotiating. The university faculty agrees to help fulfill some school based goals in exchange for cooperation with their research goals. It is best to let school people know the specific terms of the exchange agreement. Agreements between university and school personnel should be recorded

in minutes of their meeting so that each has a clear idea of what is expected. Both parties should read over and revise these minutes into a blueprint for future activities. We present some examples of negotiation between university and school people in our discussion of tailor making inservice during the implementation phase of the Project.

4. Learning to be Patient

Of all the lessons we learned in our first year, learning to be patient was perhaps the most difficult. In the beginning stages of the Project, it was not uncommon for teachers to break appointments at the last minute, to arrive at a workshop explaining that they had to leave in ten minutes, or to politely request that we stop pestering them. Because the Project staff and university people had to drive over half an hour to our schools, these behaviors were particularly disheartening. In one school, we were pretty much ignored for several months.

Patience also dictated that we start small. Taking advice from Dale Mann in Making Change Happen, our aim was to gain the acceptance of a "critial mass" of teachers at each school.[7] Mann defines a critical mass as approximately one quarter of a school staff. This modest expectation allowed frequent meetings with many individual teachers and small groups over the course of the year. Each of our teams began their efforts by contacting one or two teachers whom the principal or colleagues had identified as potentially interested in Project activities. Sometimes, two or three meetings with these individuals were necessary before we could suggest that other teachers might want to join us. Other times, a teacher would ask us to come back the following week when they would arrange to invite their colleagues. These key individuals were much more successful in recruiting other teachers than we were. When they began a meeting saying, "these people can help us", the battle was more than half over.

Negativism flourishes in large groups. When the same topic was presented in a large faculty meeting and in a small informal group, the topic would be greeted with silence in the large meeting, but spark lively discussion in the smaller group. We learned to approach large groups of teachers only when we had established our cadre of support.

For the better part of our first year, we were unsuccessful in building a cadre at one of the Project schools. When this school staff repeatedly refused to participate in Project activities, we simply waited. It took several months before they made a tentative request for a workshop to improve writing skills. They were pleased with the workshop and soon requested assistance in other areas. We are convinced that a more aggressive approach at this school would have resulted in the staff severing ties with our Project. The payoff for patience is today a strong cadre of teachers who are enthusiastic supporters of Teacher Corps.

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

During the second and third year of the Project, our task was to implement the changes planned during our initiation year. We continued many of the strategies to win over school staffs to research utilization described under our initiation phase. We had to keep abreast of changing needs and to continue to build trust, especially as we brought new Project staff on board. The process of negotiating between researchers and practitioners is an ongoing one as the priorities of the schools shift and the researcher's agenda changes. Finally, we still consider patience a virtue, albeit a difficult one to attain, in any phase of a research utilization program.

Implementation, however, required a new set of strategies to add to our repetoire. In the second year of our Project, the district terminated about a quarter of the teaching staff. The third year began with a Teacher Strike. When

issues of economic survival are at stake, it is difficult to convince teachers and administrators that research utilization should be a priority. We had to motivate them.

We developed three different types of rewards for motivating school staffs to collaborate with researchers. These were extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards and organizational rewards. The extrinsic rewards included a variety of incentives designed to motivate school people to attend inservice activities. Intrinsic rewards insured that the inservice activities are tailor-made to the needs of the practitioners. Organizational rewards were aimed at administrators to encourage their participation in and support of research utilization activities.

Extrinsic rewards: A variety of incentives

Extrinsic rewards are important because research utilization activities take place after school, during vacations and on weekends--times which school practitioners consider their "own". Rewards are also necessary because many practitioners have had unfortunate experiences with researchers. Most teachers and adminstrators working in districts near to universities have devoted energy to providing data for someone's study. Too often, they have been interviewed, observed and tested without learning anything about the results or implications of the study.

The traditional reward for practitioners in professional growth programs is college credit that earns teachers increments in pay. We found that this reward had only limited appeal. Many of the teachers in our schools, and in schools throughout the nation, have "topped out" on the salary schedule. We continued to accredit many of our activities with teachers, however, because a few of the younger teachers were very anxious to add to their low salaries through increments for professional training.

Unfortunately the high tuition and stringent entrance requirements at Stanford University prevented us from offering a degree program to teachers and administrators.

Other Teacher Corps Projects have had great success involving practitioners by organizing their inservice acitivities into a two-year Masters program. Still others have developed specific credential programs in bilingual education and Special Education which have been very effective in motivating teachers to work with university professors.

Another incentive unavailable to us was released time. Teacher Corps does not allow funds to pay substitutes to release teachers. Nevertheless we mention release time as an important incentive because the literature is clear, "that money is not as important as time in the provision of incentives".[8]

Since the traditional rewards of an advanced degree and released time were unavailable to us, and college credits appealed to only a few teachers, we had to provide other incentives. As we began to investigate possible rewards for teachers, we were struck by the negative reward system in schools. Highly regarded teachers usually end up with more students, more than their share of "problem" youngsters, and the dubious distinction of serving on more committees than their less respected peers. To try and counteract this system in our project, we agreed to "take care of our teachers". The rewards that we found most appealing to teachers were paying stipends, conducting activities at the school site or in pleasant places off campus, scheduling inservice training at convenient times, providing materials and refreshments, and building in careful follow-up for each activity. Two other extrinsic rewards came as by-products of participation - recognition and rejuvenation.

Although our funds to pay teachers for participating in the Project were extremely limited, they did serve as a symbolic gesture of respect. To pay a teacher ten dollars for participating in a long meeting or thirty dollars for a ten-session workshop may sound insulting. However, we found that many teachers were able to

pay the babysitter, the extra mileage or buy lunch with their taken amount. All interpreted the small stipends as conveying a sense of appreciation for their time and commitment.

Locating activities at or near the school site rather than at the university was also perceived as a reward. Teachers agreed that having professors come to them was a refreshing change. They also felt more comfortable in collaborating with researchers as equals on their own turf. For some activities, particularly retreats or full day work sessions, teachers and administrators preferred to leave the school. We held these sessions in local libraries, banks, Community Centers, homes of Project staff or school administrators, and occasionally at the Faculty Club. These sessions had the added benefit of no interruptions, so common during meetings at the school site.

Scheduling each activity depended upon the convenience of the practitioner and the goals of that activity. For example, some of our administrative team retreats were held for two days prior to the opening of school. This gave the team time to organize for the first few weeks of school. For short information sessions, we often requested to be part of a regular faculty meeting in order to avoid asking teachers to stay after school for an additional meeting. After school training sessions always ended on time and never later than 5:00 p.m.

Materials that teachers can use in their classrooms are very effective rewards. In all of our training sessions, we tried to find material that teachers could use immediately. In our multi-cultural component, we established a Resource Bank compiling all the materials we collected from Stanford and other agencies. Teachers ordered materials and supplemented the files by sending copies of their successful multi-cultural units or lessons. Our monthly newsletter also included the best multicultural lesson plans we could find.

As a regular part of our workshops and mini-courses, we came into teachers classrooms, upon request, to help them implement the ideas they learned from researchers. We agree with Bruce Joyce that "it appears to be insufficient to permit transfer of training to be the responsibility of the teacher alone, something he simply accomplishes as he carries out his various roles as teacher."[9] Follow up activities are not only useful to practitioners. They also help researchers learn how to adjust their presentations to make them more useful to classroom teachers. Classroom observations and demonstration lessons are proof of the researchers interest in making their activities relevant to the classroom.

Recognition is especially important in schools where salary and working conditions are unrelated to merit. Teachers and administrators who participated in various research utilization activities received recognition in a variety of ways. Many become resident experts in their school and presented their new knowledge in faculty or departmental meetings. A few were invited to speak to classes at Stanford. Administrators and teachers from our Project gave presentations at the Teacher Corps Regional Conference and the Association of California School Administrators annual meeting.

Related to recognition is rejuvination - the opportunity to do something new and exciting. As we plan for our fourth year of the Project, we are developing new roles for teachers and administrators. Some of the most competent and commited participants in our research utilization activities will join our staff as part-time trainers and disseminators.

Extrinsic rewards are crucial in encouraging teachers to collaborate with researchers. Their importance is magnified in schools like ours suffering from cutbacks and declining morale. However, all the extrinsic rewards put together will not work unless the research utilization activity is perceived as being useful

and relevant. The following section describes how we tailor-made our activities to fit the needs of school people.

Intrinsic Rewards: Tailor-Made Inservice

The component structure served as the mechanism for tailor-making inservice activities. Many of the components in our Project emerged from school-specific requests for assistance. For example, an urgent request to revise the ninth grade curriculum in social studies to meet the needs of low achieving students stimulated the establishment of the Social Studies Component. The Mathematics Component was established in response to a request for inservice for teachers recently assigned to math classes. In return for providing this assistance, the Stanford faculty was granted access to the classroom for research purposes.

There were a variety of strategies used to tailor-make the inservice activities to local needs. A component might decide to respond to individual needs such as in the Writing Component, where the Stanford graduate assistant interviewed teachers to assess their inservice needs. Or a component might work with a whole school as in the case of the Reading Component which helped the staff in one of the elementary schools modify their reading assessment system. In one instance a component addressed a district-wide need by developing an assessment system for placing bilingual students in the appropriate classes. Components also varied in the degree to which the research design was made integral to the inservice activities. Some of the research activities remained quite distinct from training. They provided inservice in exchange for access to do research. While in other components, training and research were integrated. We present three case studies of tailor-making inservice. The first describes how we responded to individual needs, the second how we tailor-made inservice for a school staff and the third how we designed a program to meet the needs of the district.

Responding to Individual Needs: Writing Component

Teachers in the feeder schools expressed interest in receiving inservice on writing strategies to be used across the curriculum. In response to this interest, the Writing Component interviewed individual teachers to discover their specific interests and needs in writing. From these responses, a two-year training program was developed using the Bay Area Writing Program as the resource.

BAWP is a thorough, sequential program in composition instruction developed by practicing English teachers. It has been implemented in many school districts throughout the country. The Writing Component staff selected the BAWP training as a form of intervention because it addressed the needs identified by the teachers who were interviewed. These included: 1. determining students' capability in writing, 2. improving teachers skills in assessing writing demands in different curriculum areas, 3. increasing teacher awareness of the stages involved in the writing process, pre-writing, writing, revising, and editing, and 4. assisting in the development of teaching strategies. The graduate assistant in the Writing Component met with the BAWP consultants to design each training session. The consultants reviewed the teacher interviews and decided with the Teacher Corps Writing Component how to best meet the needs of individual teachers.

Teachers were willing to participate in the inservice because it was planned for them. In return they agreed to cooperate in the data collection phases of the research by being interviewed and filling pre and post survey forms related to their writing activities in the classroom. The research will evaluate the impact of the inservice training.

The first year training and data collection activities were followed up the second year with monthly meetings for the trained teachers to share how they were using the newly learned strategies in their classrooms. The BAWP consultant made

classroom observations as a follow up to these sessions to help teachers implement their new knowledge. The highly personal approach to inservice adopted in this Component was integrated with the research interests of the university staff. Implicit in the design is the incentive for teacher participation, research utilization and collaboration.

School Specific Assessment and Training: Reading Component

The Reading Component differs from the Writing Component in that it tailor-makes much of the inservice to a total school program rather than to specific individuals. Working with the staff and students at one of the elementary schools, the Reading Component staff demonstrated an approach for assessing reading skills using an Interactive Reading Assessment System developed by Calfee and Pointkowsky (1979). With this assessment approach, the staff conducted a content analysis of the reading materials at the school which pinpointed weak areas and assisted in identifying needed support materials and instructional strategies. In the spring of that year, the Reading Component used the information from their assessment of this school's reading program to present workshops for the total staff.

At another elementary school, the Reading Component helped revise a reading test the staff had developed over the previous summer. The revisions were followed up with school-specific inservice to assist teachers in working with the assessment system in their own reading classes. These inservice activities provided the university faculty with an opportunity to try out an assessment system they were refining. Teachers participated because they were being assisted with improving their own programs. Thus, incentives for participation were present for both practitioners and researchers.

Responding to District Concerns; BIlingual Component

The Bilingual Component was included in our Project because of the diversity of cultures and growing number of immigrants in the community we serve. Dr. Robert Politzer, the Stanford faculty member in bilingual education, was particularly interested in improving the placement of bilingual students. This was a concern shared not only by ESL and bilingual teachers but also by the district office. District staff wanted a better instrument to assess language proficiency of bilingual students in all of the San Jose schools.

In response to this need, the Bilingual Component developed an assessment instrument to measure student proficiency in Spanish, Portuguese and English, in three related but distinct skills: a. written language competence, b. oral competence, and c. linguistic subject matter. The district provided access to classrooms for field testing the instrument during the various stages of revision and modification.

With the support and endorsement of the district, teachers and administrators met with the Stanford researchers several times throughout the year to react to the test as it was being developed. Field testing the instrument involved having teachers rate the language dominance of their own students and comparing these ratings against student responses on the new test. This activity provided some of the incentive for participation. Teachers were curious about the accuracy of their own knowledge regarding student language dominance. They also were treated as valued colleagues as they assisted in developing the test items.

The final product, an improved instrument for assessing bilingual students' language capability, is to be used not only to place students but also to adjust classroom procedures and curriculum to pupils needs. The Stanford staff will pro-

vide inservice on how to use the instruments for both purposes. Ultimately, then, the inservice activities sponsored by the Bilingual Component are tailor-made to meet the needs of bilingual teachers throughout the district.

Pros and Cons of Tailor-Making Inservice

There are a number of advantages involved in tailor-making inservice to local needs as well as some limitations. First and foremost, teachers are more willing to participate if the training is closely related to their own teaching situations. Transference of new content and skills is smoother and more immediate if the training is shaped around teacher input and needs. In addition, the tailor-made approach relies heavily on collaboration between university and school staff to articulate training needs and outline training format compatible to both parties. This collaboration contributes to the establishment of long-term relationships which are predicated on trust and mutual respect. The tailor-made approach encourages researchers to modify their agendas to fit local characteristics and enlarges teachers' understanding of the complex issues related to their teaching. We have described a variety of strategies used to ensure relevance of teacher training. Staff developers interested in shaping a program to local situations can work with individuals, schools or the district level as the target group. The important incentive for involving teachers is relevance.

There are some costs in building tailor-made inservice options. The effort is labor intensive involving many people, many meetings and long hours of revisions. The final product, in the form of site-specific training activities, may be idiosyncratic to the school or group and therefore cannot easily be transferred to other settings. These deterrants, however, are not insurmountable. The payoff of getting school personnel involved when the resistance to change was considerable, has made the tailor made approcah to inservice an essential strategy for the Stanford/San Jose Unified Teacher Corps Project.

Organizational Incentives: Administrative Support

The formal authority for making change happen in schools resides in the hands of administrators at the site and district level. Their support for inservice activities is critical. They can choose to provide recognition for staff participating in inservice or ignore them. They can write letters of commendation for personnel files, arrange to release teachers to participate in inservice activities, publically recognize the contributions of these active teachers in faculty or community meetings, and informally communicate their encouragement in a host of ways. Recognition from a school administrator is a more important source of rewards than recognition from outsiders because he or she is after all, the "boss" and will probably be around long after the change project is gone. We wanted the support of administrators not only because we needed access to schools but equally important, because we needed them to reward teachers for participating in Project activities. Thus, we not only had to win over teachers to research utilization, we had to win over administrators as well.

We employed two strategies for winning over administrators. One was to include them in the design of inservice activities in their schools, the other was to provide training for them. Once again, patience and building trust and credibility were essential pre-requisites for support. The frequent meetings with principals during our initiation year allowed them to have a major impact on inservice plans and also to delineate their own training needs. Due to the cutbacks of resources from the district and support personnel at the schools, the principals needed a strong and cohesive team at each of their schools to help them. In our implementation phase, Teacher Corps responded by organizing bi-monthly training sessions for all of the teams and providing a facilitator at each site during team meetings.

The payoff for continual communication with principals and providing training to address their concerns is four supportive principals. Since they attend most

Teacher Corps sponsored activities, they know which members of their staffs are participating. Their presence and recognition of teachers extra efforts has made Project activities valued within the organization of the school.

Just as the principals involvement increased rewards for teachers, the district support of Project activities motivates other principals and teachers to participate. Once again, we learned that it is not enough to address the concerns of individual teachers. For full endorsement and support we needed to meet the needs identified by the district staff. Frequent and open communication between Project staff, the superintendent and her staff have made us aware of district-wide priorities. As we move into our dissemination and institutionalization phase we are tailor making more and more of our activities to fit these priorities. The district responds by rewarding principals and teachers with release time, positive evaluations and promotional opportunities.

In looking back at our three types of rewards for involving practitioners in research utilization activities, it is difficult to say which one is most important. They are all necessary and none of them alone is sufficient. Extrinsic rewards motivate teachers to participate in the activities; but only by tailor-making these activities, can their relevance to the classroom be insured. The final step, actually applying what is learned, needs the support of school and district administrators who recognize the value of the new knowledge and the contribution practitioners utilizing research are making in the schools.

Conclusion

The benefits of research utilization are substantial. Researchers gain knowledge of today's schools which improves their own courses and helps them design research that will have a significant impact in the field. At the same time, the

researcher is helping the classroom teacher by introducing new methods of instruction, management, student assessment, curriculum and most important, new ways of thinking about learning and teaching.

Despite these benefits, research utilization efforts may become less frequent as more schools face severe crises in funding and public support. We can certainly testify that launching and maintaining a research utilization program in schools facing budget cuts and declining morale is not easy. We do, however, disagree with the RAND study that a change project must work with "motivated participants" in a "healthy organizational climate". In fact, it is probably those schools with unhealthy climates and angry teachers who need help the most. To assist these schools through research utilization requires more than good research. We have presented several strategies that worked for us in the hope that they will be useful to other researchers working in similar schools. The essential ingredient of all our strategies is collegiality. Once researchers begin to retreat practitioners as valued colleagues rather than clients, they are well on the way to winning over school staffs to research utilization.

FOOTNOTES

1. RAND, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV, Findings in Review (prepared by Paul Berman and Edward Pauly, April 1975, p. 19.

2. Lou Carey Models of Change, Change Studies, 1980, A Journal of Research Adaptation, Teacher Corps Research Cluster.

3. This section of the paper revised from Susan Roper and Richard Jung, "Initiating Inservice Under Fire", Journal of Teaching and Learning, University of North Dakota, Vol. 5, No. 2, October 1980).

4. Dale Mann, "The Politics of Training Teachers in Schools" in Making Change Happen. Ed. Dale Mann, New York: Teachers College Press, 1978, pp. 8-9.

5. Gerald Pine. "The Certainty of Change Theory: An Analysis of Change Ideologies." Research, Adaptation and Change, Teacher Corps Research Cluster, 1980, p. 117.

6. Pine, op. cit., p. 118.

7. Dale Mann. "The Politics of Training Teachers in Schools. Making Change Happen. Ed. Dale Mann, New York: Teachers College Press, 1978, pp. 6-7.

8. Bruce Joyce, et.al. Issues to Face. ISTE Report 1, p. 20.

9. Joyce, op. cit., p. 21.

SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

1605 PARK AVENUE, SAN JOSE, CA 95126 (408) 998-6000

March 10, 1981

TO: Subject Area Teachers
Hoover Junior High School

FROM: Walter Kraus and Ann Bayer

RE: Writing Across the Curriculum Inservice, 1981-82

Do you have students who have difficulty writing? Teacher Corps, San Jose Unified School District, and Bay Area Writing Project will offer a short series of four workshops to all interested teachers who would like to work together to encourage better student writing. The workshops will be "tailor-made" to meet your needs. They will be conducted by teachers who, in their own classrooms, have implemented teaching strategies that have encouraged better student writing.

The tentative dates for this inservice program are October, November, January, and February during the 1981-1982 school year. Each participant will receive a $50.00 stipend.

If you are interested, please fill out, tear off, and send to Walter Kraus, Department of Instruction, the bottom section by March 27, 1981. All participants will be contacted in May for further planning information.

WK:AB:lp

NAME _____ GRADE _____

SCHOOL _____ SUBJECT AREA _____

I am interested in attending the 1981-1982 Writing Across the Curriculum Inservice Program at Hoover Junior High School.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Tentative Job Description

Title: Teacher Corps Writing Coordinator

Responsibilities:

1. Keeping District Staff; i.e. Walter Kraus and Teacher Corps staff; i.e. Mary Nur and Susan Roper and principal(s) of the schools involved in the training, informed about writing inservice activities.

2. Gathering information about staff needs concerning problem areas with student writing across the curriculum (i.e. using interviews or small group meetings prior to workshops).

3. Channeling information back to BAWP Consultants so that workshops are responsive to staff needs and interests.

4. If appropriate, coordinator will co-plan and co-present the workshops with BAWP consultants.

5. Evaluating each workshop to determine what teacher needs were addressed and not addressed. This information is fed back to BAWP consultant.

6. Should there be interim small group meeting, the coordinator will be responsible for overseeing these meetings.

AB:MN:lp

San Jose Unified School District
Homework 3680
Elementary Schools - Grades 1-6 3681 Revised

The basic purpose of any homework assignment in the elementary school is to help meet the needs of individual children. Homework may be assigned for the following purposes: completion of unfinished work, make-up of work after an absence, extension of classroom work, reinforcement of skills, enrichment, appropriate remediation, and development of effective study habits.

Determination of the exact kinds of homework shall be based on the professional judgment of the teacher and the needs of the students. Homework shall be assigned to all students in regular classrooms in grades one through six, unless the teacher is aware of circumstances that would make it impossible for the student to complete homework assignments. 3681.1 Revised

The suggested minimum amounts per five-day week shall be as follows: Grades one and two, sixty minutes per week; grade three, eighty minutes per week; grade four, one hundred minutes per week; grade five, one hundred-twenty minutes per week; grade six, one hundred-forty minutes per week. Homework shall most frequently be assigned Monday through Thursday, and not on the day before a holiday. 3681.2 Added

Homework should be work for which students have had prior instruction or preparation. Written homework assignments shall be assessed at school and returned home. 3681.3 Added

Students shall be responsible for the completion of all homework assignments. Parents shall cooperate with classroom teachers to achieve this objective. 3681.4 Added

Revised and adopted by Board of Education '79-80.